

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY DAUNT, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 1:19-cv-614 (Lead)

v.

JOCELYN BENSON, et al.,

Defendants.

---

MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN PARTY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

Case No.: 1:19-cv-00669 (Member)

v.

HON. JANET T. NEFF

JOCELYN BENSON, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO EXCEED WORD LIMIT**

Plaintiffs Michigan Republican Party, Laura Cox, Terri Lynn Land, Savina Alexandra Zoe Mucci, Dorian Thompson, and Hank Vaupel, by and through their counsel, Dykema Gossett PLLC and Dickinson Wright PLLC, respectfully move this Court for permission to exceed the 10,800-word limit for a brief filed in opposition to a dispositive motion.

On August 22, 2019, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint (Member Case, ECF No. 1) against Defendant Jocelyn Benson, in her official capacity as Secretary of State, alleging constitutional violations arising under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution from the creation and implementation of the redistricting commission established by adoption of

Michigan Proposal 2 of 2018. Contemporaneously with the Complaint, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Brief in Support (Member Case, ECF Nos. 2 and 3).

On September 6, 2019, Defendant Voters Not Politicians (“VNP”) intervened as a Defendant (Member Case, ECF No. 15).

Thereafter, Defendants filed Requests for a Pre-Motion Conference (Member Case, ECF Nos. 17, 20), in which they expressed an intention to file Motions to Dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 12.

On September 11, 2019, the Court entered an Order (Lead Case, ECF No. 30) consolidating cases and setting deadlines for filing responses to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction and any replies thereto, and for filing Defendants’ anticipated Motions to Dismiss and responses and any replies thereto.

Pursuant to the Court’s Order, on September 19, 2019, Defendants filed their Briefs in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Lead Case, ECF Nos. 36, 45), as well as their anticipated Motions to Dismiss (Lead Case, ECF Nos. 37, 48) with accompanying Briefs (Lead Case, ECF Nos. 38, 49).

W.D. Mich. LCivR 7.2(b)(i) states that a brief filed in opposition to a dispositive motion shall not exceed 10,800 words. To avoid unduly burdening the Court with repetitious legal argument, contemporaneous with this Motion, Plaintiffs have filed a single, consolidated brief captioned as Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Response to Defendants’ Respective Motions to Dismiss and Consolidated Reply to Defendants’ Respective Responses to Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

Due to the complex, constitutional issues raised in this action, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant their request to exceed the 10,800-word limit. The Parties agree that this matter presents only legal issues for the Court, so it is likely that resolution of the pending

Motions will be highly influential on the outcome of this action. Accordingly, complete briefing is of the utmost importance.

Counsel for Plaintiffs sought concurrence from Defendants' respective counsel, and concurrence was given.

Wherefore, Plaintiffs request that the Court grant their Motion to Exceed Word Limit.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 3, 2019

/s/ Gary P. Gordon  
Gary P. Gordon (P26290)  
Jason T. Hanselman (P61813)  
Scott A. Hughes (P75486)  
Dykema Gossett PLLC  
Counsel for Plaintiffs  
201 Townsend Street, Suite 900  
Lansing, MI 48933  
(517) 374-9133

Charles R. Spies (P83260)  
Robert L. Avers (P75396)  
Dickinson Wright PLLC  
Counsel for Plaintiffs  
215 South Washington Square, Suite 200  
Lansing, MI 48933  
(517) 371-1730

113759.000004 4848-7292-1000.1